Federal jurisdiction had existed; and

United States District Court Southern District of Texas

<u>ENTERED</u>

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

April 23, 2024 Nathan Ochsner, Clerk

for the Southern District of Texas United States of America v. Case No. 4:24-mj-00169-1 Ruben Jerman Aviles Defendant

ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL

Part I - Eligibility for Detention

Up	on	the
----	----	-----

☑ Motion of the Government attorney pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1), or	
\square Motion of the Government or Court's own motion pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(2),

the Court held a detention hearing and found that detention is warranted. This order sets forth the Court's findings of fact and conclusions of law, as required by 18 U.S.C. § 3142(i), in addition to any other findings made at the hearing.

Part II - Findings of Fact and Law as to Presumptions under § 3142(e)

☐ A. Rebuttable Presumption Arises Under 18 U.S.C. § 3142(e)(2) (previous violator): There is a rebuttable presumption that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the safety of any other person and the community
because the following conditions have been met:
□ (1) the defendant is charged with one of the following crimes described in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1):
☐ (a) a crime of violence, a violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1591, or an offense listed in 18 U.S.C.
§ 2332b(g)(5)(B) for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed; or
\Box (b) an offense for which the maximum sentence is life imprisonment or death; or
□ (c) an offense for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed in the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. §§ 801-904), the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. §§ 951-971), or Chapter 705 of Title 46, U.S.C. (46 U.S.C. §§ 70501-70508); or
□ (d) any felony if such person has been convicted of two or more offenses described in subparagraphs (a) through (c) of this paragraph, or two or more State or local offenses that would have been offenses described in subparagraphs (a) through (c) of this paragraph if a circumstance giving rise to Federal jurisdiction had existed, or a combination of such offenses; or
☐ (e) any felony that is not otherwise a crime of violence but involves:
(i) a minor victim; (ii) the possession of a firearm or destructive device (as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 921); (iii) any other dangerous weapon; or (iv) a failure to register under 18 U.S.C. § 2250; and
□ (2) the defendant has previously been convicted of a Federal offense that is described in 18 U.S.C.
§ 3142(f)(1), or of a State or local offense that would have been such an offense if a circumstance giving rise to

- □ (3) the offense described in paragraph (2) above for which the defendant has been convicted was committed while the
- defendant was on release pending trial for a Federal, State, or local offense; and

☐ (4) a period of not more than five years has elapsed since the date of conviction, or the release of the defendant from imprisonment, for the offense described in paragraph (2) above, whichever is later.
 ☑ B. Rebuttable Presumption Arises Under 18 U.S.C. § 3142(e)(3) (narcotics, firearm, other offenses): There is a rebuttable presumption that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the appearance of the defendant as required and the safety of the community because there is probable cause to believe that the defendant committed one or more of the following offenses: ☑ (1) an offense for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed in the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. §§ 801-904), the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. §§ 951-971), or Chapter 705 of Title 46, U.S.C. (46 U.S.C. §§ 70501-70508); ☐ (2) an offense under 18 U.S.C. §§ 924(c), 956(a), or 2332b; ☐ (3) an offense listed in 18 U.S.C. § 2332b(g)(5)(B) for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed; ☐ (4) an offense under Chapter 77 of Title 18, U.S.C. (18 U.S.C. §§ 1581-1597) for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 20 years or more is prescribed; or ☐ (5) an offense involving a minor victim under 18 U.S.C. §§ 1201, 1591, 2241, 2242, 2244(a)(1), 2245, 2251, 2251A, 2252(a)(1), 2252(a)(2), 2252(a)(3), 2252A(a)(1), 2252A(a)(2), 2252A(a)(4), 2260, 2421, 2422, 2423,
or 2425. □ C. Conclusions Regarding Applicability of Any Presumption Established Above
 ☑ The defendant has not introduced sufficient evidence to rebut the presumption above—<u>at least with respect to danger to the community</u>—and detention is ordered on that basis. OR
☑ The defendant has presented evidence sufficient to rebut the presumption—with respect to risk of non-appearance—but after considering the presumption and the other factors discussed below, detention is warranted.
Part III - Analysis and Statement of the Reasons for Detention
After considering the factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(g) and the information presented at the detention hearing, the Court concludes that the defendant must be detained pending trial because the Government has proven:
In addition to any findings made on the record at the hearing, the reasons for detention include the following:
 ☑ Weight of evidence against the defendant is strong ☑ Subject to lengthy period of incarceration if convicted ☑ Prior criminal history ☐ Participation in criminal activity while on probation, parole, or supervision ☐ History of violence or use of weapons ☑ History of alcohol or substance abuse ☐ Lack of stable employment ☐ Lack of stable residence

AO 472 (Rev. 11/16) Order of Detention Pending Trial

☐ Lack of financially responsible sureties
☐ Lack of significant community or family ties to this district
☐ Significant family or other ties outside the United States
☐ Lack of legal status in the United States
☐ Subject to removal or deportation after serving any period of incarceration
☐ Prior failure to appear in court as ordered
\boxtimes Prior attempt(s) to evade law enforcement
☐ Use of alias(es) or false documents
☐ Background information unknown or unverified
☐ Prior violations of probation, parole, or supervised release

OTHER REASONS OR FURTHER EXPLANATION:

Even if Defendant Jerman Aviles rebutted the presumption favoring his detention, the Government met its burden to show that his detention is warranted due to the danger to the community and risk of non-appearance posed if he were released. First, Defendant's dangerousness is supported by compelling evidence that he conspired to purchase with the intent to distribute kilogram quantities of cocaine. Based on the Government's evidence, Defendant also recruited at least one other person to help with the scheme, thereby indicating that he was not a low-level participant. Such a degree of involvement in drug dealing, and in kilogram quantities, inherently endangers the community. Beyond that, Defendant's criminal history shows that he has already caused physical harm to others, as reflected by his prior State convictions for intoxication assault with a vehicle and colliding with another person, causing serious bodily injury.

Second, Defendant's risk of non-appearance is reflected by his conduct evading law enforcement for more than an hour, in dense woods, before his arrest in this case. Compounding that, Defendant has a prior conviction for felony evading arrest.

Third, the Court has no confidence that Defendant would abide by any release restrictions designed to safeguard the public and ensure his appearance. On two prior occasions, Defendant's probation was revoked. The last occasion was barely two years ago, for which a 4-year sentence of deferred adjudication probation (connected with the charge of evading arrest) was revoked, resulting in a sentence of 893 days' incarceration. Although Defendant successfully completed a term of parole following incarceration for vehicular assault, barely a month had passed before he relapsed by allegedly conspiring to acquire and distribute cocaine. Moreover, Defendant was already living with his family, at the same residence, when the latest conduct occurred. Returning him to the same living circumstances therefore fails to provide adequate assurance that Defendant would comply with any conditions that the Court could impose. Indeed, Defendant has an even greater incentive to flee now that he is facing a potentially lengthy prison sentence.

As a result, it is **ORDERED** that Defendant Ruben Jerman Aviles be **DETAINED** pending trial.

Part IV - Directions Regarding Detention

The defendant is remanded to the custody of the Attorney General or to the Attorney General's designated representative for confinement in a corrections facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving sentences or being held in custody pending appeal. The defendant must be afforded a reasonable opportunity for private consultation with defense counsel. On order of a court of the United States or on request of an attorney for the Government, the person in charge of the corrections facility must deliver the defendant to a United States Marshal for the purpose of an appearance in connection with a court proceeding.

Date: April 21, 2024

United States Magistrate Judge